

The Principia.

First Principles in Religion, Morals, Government, and the Economy of Life.

VOL. I.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1860.

NO. 15.

The Principia

Published Weekly, at 339 Pearl Street, (two doors above
Harpers' Buildings) New-York.

WILLIAM GOODSELL, Editor.

SAMUEL WILDS, Proprietor.

Terms: One Dollar a year, in advance.

Direct business letters, with remittances, to

MELANCTHON B. WILLIAMS, Publishing Agent,

as above

PROSPECTUS.

Our object, by this publication, is to promote pure religion, sound morals, Christian reforms; the abolition of slaveholding, caste, the rum-traffic, and kindred crimes—the application of Christian principles to all the relations, duties, business arrangements, and aims of life;—to the individual, the family, the Church, the State, the Nation—to the work of converting the world to God, restoring the common brotherhood of man, and rendering Society the type of heaven. Our text book is the Bible; our standard, the Divine law; our expediency, obedience; our plan, the Gospel; our trust, the Divine promise; our purpose, the whole armor of God.

—Editors friendly, please copy, or notice.

Way-marks in the Moral War with Slavery.

BY REV. HENRY T. CHEEVER.

No. III.

It is to be noted here, that another reason which keeps some men who call themselves Anti-Slavery, from admitting the position that Slaveholding is sin in itself, is that they hold that there are cases of Slaveholding for benevolent purposes, and that therefore we cannot treat Slaveholding as *malum in se*, as inherently sinful. This analyzed, means that there are cases of doing evil that good may come, and to shield such from condemnation, we must not say that Slaveholding is inherently sinful. It is as much as to say that there are benevolent and good men who are Slaveholders, and if you declare Slaveholding inherently sinful, it will condemn those benevolent and good men, and make them sinners. And herein lies the reason of the great unwillingness, on the part of many, to brand Slaveholding as inherently sinful, as *malum in se*. They can condemn the system of Slavery as diabolism itself, but are unwilling to pronounce the act or practice of Slaveholding—the only point at which slavery can be chargeable at all, with moral character—as necessarily sinful.

We know not which to pity most, in such men, what would appear to be their mental obtuseness, and incapacity to be held by a principle, or their enslavement to a false system of ethics, which forbids their saying that slavery is *malum in se*. These brethren, it has been well said, "who stick about the *malum in se*, who reluctant against declaring the inherent sinfulness of Slavery, and employ themselves in the ditch of such refinement and technicalities about the 'legal relation,' never attempting one blow against the sin, and at length, losing all power and opportunity of attacking it—are sticking in the mud." As was said of the battle with the Chinese, in which the English perished miserably, by hundreds, in the ditches of Peiho, the struggle was against mud, not against Chinamen; so now in this conflict the struggle is against mud; the ditches that those apologizing and sophisticating and bog-trotting theologians have filled, to protect this iniquity from assault, are of mud, even to the chin. Your ammunition is all wetted, if you plunge in and attempt to cross; and if you stick there, even the darkness cannot cover you, for their blue lights will mark you, and you are shot down in your helplessness.

A writer in the Free Church Portfolio for October, 1859, very thoroughly disposes of the learned nonsense in regard to *malum in se*, as follows:

"Since the revival of the African Slave trade has forced upon the public attention the subject of American Slavery, editors of so-called religious newspapers and doctors of Slaveholding Divinity, with a view of shielding the great parent iniquity which has its stronghold in the churches, are bandying about the legal phrase *malum in se*. Blackstone in his Commentaries on the laws of England defines *malum*

in se to be a breach of the 'Superior Law,' by which he means the Law of God, and which he recognizes as paramount in authority. Murder is *malum in se*. So are theft and perjury. The term is distinguished from *malum prohibitum*, which defines an act to be wrong only because its commission is prohibited by the Supreme Legislative power in the State. If a man were to put into the Croton Reservoir fifty barrels of prussic acid, with a view of poisoning the inhabitants of New York, the act, in its intention and consequence, would be *malum in se*, an intrinsic, essential sin, inexcusable and unjustifiable. But if a citizen of Pennsylvania, within the limits of the State, passes a bank bill of a lower denomination than five dollars—or if he shoot wood-cocks between the first day of February and the fourth day of July—that is only *malum prohibitum*. The sinfulness that attaches to these acts is simply that of violating a statute. There is no inherent evil in them, as there is in murder, theft, or perjury.

"Now, as a Christian, we take the ground that Slaveholding is *malum in se*—a sin in itself considered. The verdict of humanity is, that wilful, intentional Slaveholding, such as it is defined to be by the slave-laws, and the practice under those laws, is *malum in se*—the most daring insult a man can offer to his God, and the highest crime one man can commit upon another. And yet, when the law itself declares that slaves, not their services, 'shall be deemed and taken as chattels personal in the hands of their owners,' a professed minister of Jesus Christ will throw dust in the eyes of his brethren, and make them believe that such a crime against God and Man as the Slaveholder commits, is no sin!

"Now the reason that slavery bids defiance to heaven and earth—the reason that it has demanded the revival of the slave-trade—is that the churches and their ministers have not treated it as *malum in se*, an inherent sin. The *malum in se* doctrine is the spear of Ithuriel with which the church could inflict a deadly wound upon the monster of slavery, if she would. And because she does not she must be set down as the bulwark of the system.

On the other hand, a writer in the Oberlin Evangelist, in an article republished with commendation by the N. Y. Independent, says:

"Define Slaveholding to be the intentional treatment of a man as mere property, a thing, and you make all slavery a sin in itself, and every slaveholder a sinner. Give it such a definition as not to include, in every instance, a wicked intention, and slaveholding is no longer a sin in itself, even if it be a sin in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred. For ourselves we prefer the popular statement, slavery is wrong (not slaveholding is sinful)—as a system it is unjust and mischievous; and if every one who practices it is not guilty of injustice and wickedness, it is because there is some peculiarity in his relations to the system which saves him from complicity in the wrong."

Now, without commenting here upon what we believe to be the erroneous and loose admissions and reasonings of this article, we say that before anything at all can be made out of such a distinction, the meaning of terms must be settled. And we are bound to use language with the signification ordinarily attached to it. The definitions of the standard dictionary and the usage of common life are to govern us. We cannot make definitions for our purpose, but must take them as they are. What, then, are they? Webster defines a slave to be "a person who is wholly subject to the will of another." "A slave is the absolute property of his master, and may be sold in any way." Slavery is, by the same authority, defined to be "bondage; the state of entire subjection of one person to the will of another." Slaveholder is "one who holds slaves." Slaveholding is, according to the same, "holding persons in slavery," and by the definition of ecclesiastical bodies which have pronounced upon it, it is "the holding of human beings as property." This is universally understood by "slaveholding." And if a writer or speaker wishes to be understood to mean anything else by it than holding and using man as property, he is careful to indicate it by the phrase "legal relation of slaveholder," or "nominal slaveholding," or "apparent slaveholding under slave laws." By the term slaveholding unqualified, is universally understood nothing else than the act or practice of holding human beings as property. There

is not meant by it the sustaining of any relation, but the holding and treating of men as property, not their services merely, but themselves.

Now, if anything is sin and evil of itself, and necessarily so, this must be. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in 1818 declared this to be "a clear violation of the Law of God in every precept, and totally inconsistent with the Gospel of Jesus Christ." The fathers of the Presbyterian Church quoted the definition of Grotius, and embodied it in their Confession of Faith, that "slaveholding was man-stealing." The Old School Covenanter Synod, at its recent meeting in Pittsburgh, resolved,

Chinese emigrants from that State, and yet be entirely constitutional for a State to pass laws excluding natives of our own country from settling within its bounds; or what is still more atrocious, expelling free colored, or white people

In all condemnations of slavery and slaveholding by individuals, and by ecclesiastical bodies, we contend that nothing is meant and nothing is condemned but actual slavery and slaveholding, that is, the holding of human beings as property. No quibbles of sophistry, or contortions of logic, or deference to power, can shield that from condemnation* by the conscience of all Christendom, as *malum in se*. The only real difference between the phraseology declaring "the holding of human beings as property to be an immorality, the renunciation of which ought to be made a condition of membership in the Christian Church," and the phraseology declaring that "slaveholding is an immorality, the renunciation of which ought to be made a condition of membership in the Christian Church," is that the latter phraseology employs one word with a fixed meaning, to express what the former phraseology takes five words to express.

*The whole subject about which so much has been said, which has been promotive of so much agitation, may be stated in brief:—Slaveholding churches, and slaveholding and slave supporting individuals by their acts and teachings, have placed the entire American church in antagonism with the moral sense of the world. Shall it remain in that position? Henceforth there is to be no more serfdom in Russia—no more slavery in Turkey. Borneo and Surinam are on the verge of freedom, but in America, slavery demands the legalizing of a trade which the world has pronounced to be piracy, for the support and perpetuation of that system which American Christianity declares to be ordained of God. There is no country in the world, at the present time, which is not open to the circulation of the Bible—none save the southern portion of the United States! There, it is criminal to sell the Bible to a slave, it is criminal to teach him to read, and American Christianity boldly declares that "no relation can be conceived of on earth more favorable to salvation than that of slavery!" American Christianity sustains the laws which make it criminal for members of the church to read the Bible. American Christianity makes God the author and supporter of that system which breaks the marriage relation, and brings in its train all the abominations of heathenism. American Doctors of Divinity, who find ready access to Northern pulpits, declare that life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness never were the inalienable right of the individual man! Thus supported, American justice proclaims from the highest tribunal, that black men have no rights which white men are bound to respect. American Christianity professing to have the everlasting gospel of the Son of God, goes forth to preach this righteousness to the heathen nations! The American church committed as a defender of these declarations for slavery, by word and by acts, by preaching from the pulpit, and by transactions at the auction block, has said to the world, that slavery is right: but freedom is silent in the church. To be silent longer is to be criminal. The time has come, when the church—the Anti-slavery sentiment of the church, must be heard. The church has a solemn duty and obligation before God, as his agent for the conversion of the world, to set itself right before the world. Let nothing be done in anger—let there be no want of Christian charity, let there be no ill-feeling towards our Southern brethren. Charity suffereth long and is kind; but charity is just as well as kind. "Be ye not partakers of other men's sins." Let the declaration of the missionary apostle of Persia, be kept in remembrance, that "primarily the influence of Northern Christians is the strongest and most responsible support of the system," and let the churches, without delay, prayerfully and considerately say to the world, that they have no part or lot in the system. Let the church be redeemed from its false position before the world.

—C. in the Congregationalist.

Is Slavery a State Institution?

We are in the habit of regarding a State Institution as existing by State authority, for a State's benefit. Anything must, at least, have the public good for its object, and the sanction of the State, to be properly a State Institution. Agriculture, manufactures, and arts, though they may be encouraged by a State Government for public good, yet, as they exist independently of State authority, and are pursued mainly for private benefit, are not regarded as State Institutions. Least of all would we dignify as a State Institution, anything introduced without State authority, and, at the same time, ruinous to every State interest. Let unprincipled men get the control of a State Government, and make enactments in favor of gambling, rum-selling, or some other vice, calling it a State Institution, and would it be anything but a curse entailed upon the State?

But we must not play round our question too long. Is slavery a State Institution? We might answer the question more easily, if we knew the ground upon which slavery claims to be any Institution at all. If slaves are property, it is hard to understand why the ownership of such property should make an Institution, any more than the ownership of cattle, of land, or of merchandize. We do not hear cattle-breeders, landholders or merchants, talking of their institutions. If they were disposed so to talk, they would be slow to admit that their institutions belong to the State. How, then, is slavery a State Institution? Are slaves the State's property? No. Is slavery instituted for the State's benefit? Never. The gratification of a comparative few, who desire to enjoy the unpaid labor of other men, is the sole motive that leads to its establishment. Does not slavery, by making slaves property, enrich a State? Reduce half of the people of a State to slavery, and that half will be hopelessly poor. Less than half of the other half, will own the slaves. Thus wealth will be concentrated in few hands. But general poverty will prevail. Does not slavery promote the security of the people? Yes, the security of pistols under your pillow! At least, then, if a State Government establishes slavery, though it is not done for the public good, is not slavery in some sense, a State Institution? Perhaps so. But we have the authority of slaveholders themselves, to say that slavery is not even established by State Governments. In a debate on the Fugitive Slave Bill, in the United States Senate, in 1850, Mr. Mason of Virginia, opposing a jury trial for slaves, distinctly admitted that no law could be produced in any of the slave States, to show that slavery was established by existing laws. Other Southern statesmen, including Mr. Calhoun, are said to have made the same admission. The establishment of slavery is a work of lawless power, which lawless men can do for themselves. They want no aid from Government, till the work is done. But when slavery is established, they find the need of some regulations about it, and some aid from Government in keeping their slaves. And they secure such enactments as they may need, by the wealth, power, and influence, which slavery brings into their hands. Such enactments made by a State Government, not for the State's benefit, but for the pleasure of slaveholders, are the sole ground upon which slavery can be respected as a State Institution.

But if, on such grounds, slavery should command our respect, as a State Institution, on grounds precisely similar, it should be honored as a Federal Institution. Is State Legislation at the service of slavery? So is Federal Legislation. Does the State Judiciary, honor and sustain slavery? Not more than does the Federal Judiciary. If a State's militia hastens at the call of slavery, the Federal army steps equally quick. How much blood has the nation poured out for slavery? Has it all been wasted for an institution, which the Federal Union may not call its own? So far, the Federal Government and the State Governments, in their support of slavery, go hand in hand. But the Federal Government in its diplomacy has one exclusive claim of gratitude on slavery. In looking out for the slave interest abroad, the Federal Government does what no State Government can do.

We may proceed further, in showing that the relation of slavery to a State Government, and its relation to the Federal Government are the same. In our Union, a man enjoys a double citizenship, and can claim the protection of two Governments, a State Government and the Federal Government. If either gives him the protection it owes, he cannot be enslaved under the other. If the Federal Government

secures to him his right to vote and be voted for, as a Federal citizen, to enjoy the Post-office, and use other privileges of his citizenship, or if his State Government protects him as a State citizen, he may bid defiance to all who would chattelize him. As he has a claim upon two Governments for protection, it will require the consent, and nothing but the consent of both, to put him in a condition in which his chattelization can be effected. But in all cases in which men are chattelized in our Union, this consent of two Governments is given, and it is the only thing done by either of them, to effect the establishment of slavery. When slavery is once established by the lawlessness of individuals, it cannot stand a single day, if both the Federal and State Governments do not recognize and sanction it, or if either Government proceeds on the assumption that no slavery exists and protects all its people alike. We cannot, therefore, escape from the conclusion, that if slavery has a shadow of ground to be called an Institution, it is quite as much a Federal as a State Institution.

I wish to correct a mistake. In my first article on the Constitutional Oath, in the PRINCIPIA of Jan. 28, the proper name, twice printed, LANESVILLE, should have been ZANESVILLE. L. S.

The following extracts are from a Correspondent of the N. Y. Times.

EMANCIPATION IN JAMAICA.

A Tour of Observation—Spanish Town—St. Thomas-in-the-Vale—Mount Diabolo—The Moneague.

KINGSTON, Jamaica, January, 1860.

I don't think I can do better, in the discussion of this West India Labor question, than describe, as consisely as possible, a somewhat extended tour that I have recently made through the interior of Jamaica. The impressions formed by this trip are certainly not unfavorable to an ultimate revival of the Island's prosperity nor to the industry and capacity of its peasantry, when properly trained and directed. In spite of the desolation that has overtaken the Colony, I sincerely think that, consistently with truth, the prospects of the Island under free labor can be spoken of much more hopefully than native and foreign depreciators love to represent. Now, I am not seeking a controversy. I simply express an opinion, (which I believe to be an unbiased opinion,) after having given all the attention in my power to the subject. That opinion, right or wrong, can only be taken for what it is worth. Furthermore, I do not for a moment pretend that Jamaica is free from idleness and vice. I do not for a moment pretend that her peasantry are as laborious as you will find men in New-York, New England or an Old England agricultural district. It is not natural that they should be so. But as far as my experience goes—and this is all I wish to assert—industry among the free population of Jamaica is the rule, and not the exception; and if idleness be an exception broader than we could wish—larger than any North American country presents—we must look for the cause, not to the intractable disposition of the negro, but to the faults of discipline or absence of education for which the governing classes are responsible; and, in no small degree, to the overwhelming temptation that a West Indian climate offers to all, white and black, to enjoy their *otium aut sine dignitate*.

With education in its infancy over the whole island—in some districts almost struggling for existence—the people are largely represented. I think a majority of them are intelligent enough to exercise the right of voting to their own advantage and to the advantage of this great Dependency of the British Crown, but it is an experiment not yet fully and fairly tried. It is an experiment which will entirely remove the government of the island from the control of the planters—a control which for some time they have seemed utterly indifferent about possessing. The Plantocracy of Jamaica is a thing of the past, and in its stead Democracy is lifting up its head. I am not so enthusiastic a Democrat as to believe that the principles of our political faith will flourish in any soil or in any climate. The untutored negro, of all people in the world, is most easily influenced by a bribe, and daguogues and office-hunters are plentiful in Jamaica. If the experiment of popular representation, under certain doubtful restrictions imposed by the new Constitution of Jamaica, should prove a failure, there will be no recourse left but to establish here such a Government as exists in the Crown Colonies of Trinidad and British Guiana.

The one is ruled by a Council, the other by a Court of Policy—synonymous terms of a go-ahead despotism, which Canada or Australia would not tolerate for an instant, but which appears to answer very well for an embryo civilization and a mixed population.

Instead, the principal village in St. Thomas-in-the-Vale lies in the centre of an almost circular hollow, shut in by mountains. The road-side is studded with the cottages of small settlers. I entered one or two of the most ragged and dilapidated, and they were invariably clean. Some were a mere frame-work of bamboo, with a thatched roof of cocoanut leaves. Still they looked comfortable. They kept out the rain and let in the breeze, and this is all that is needed in a West India climate. They were more tasteful and far cleaner than the dwellings of North American Indians. Supposing the advantages of education equal, I should not hesitate to declare in favor of the superior intelligence, honesty, industry and sobriety of the West India negro, when compared with any specimen of the American Indian that could be produced, though it has been the fashion to regard the latter as belonging to the superior race.

The forest has disappeared, and coffee and pimento plantations have taken its place; the houses of proprietors look no longer dilapidated; the pens and pasturage lands might be mistaken for New York farms. At the Moneague, a village lying on the northern slope of the mountains just crossed, the traveler will pause to sleep, if it be late, but to feed under any circumstances, for the hotel, built only ten years ago, (wonderful fact for Jamaica!) is the best in the island.

The Moneague is in St. Anne's—a very charming parish, that grows very little sugar. I protest against the West Indian valuation of a place by the quantity of sugar that it actually produces. There is not a sugar estate near the Moneague, but settlers, of whom there are many, have to pay \$6 to \$10 an acre a year for land—a sum that would purchase land out and out in other districts quite as fertile as this. But the climate here is healthy; the grass can almost be seen growing; the horses are strong and the oxen fat; vegetables are plentiful; fruit is luxuriant; and everything seems to thrive. I don't wonder, when the inhabitants of Moneague declare that no money would induce them to live anywhere else.

The road lies through a wooded and rather swampy district, and if it be a Saturday morning, the traveler will encounter, for several miles, a continuous stream of sturdy, good looking wenches, carrying on their heads to the Spanish Town market most marvelous loads of fruit and vegetables. A few of them, more fortunate than their fellows, have donkeys with well filled panniers, but they do not, on this account, neglect the inevitable head-load. Considering the distance they come, the heat of the weather, the size of their burdens, and the paltry remuneration they get at market, the performance is highly creditable to the enterprise, energy and activity of Jamaica negro women. I doubt whether our laboring men could execute the same task; they certainly would not undertake it for the same consideration. I stopped and asked some of these women where their husbands and brothers were. They seemed surprised at the question, and grinned broadly. "Were they at home?" No. "Were they at work?" Yes.

Negro settlers are always to be found clinging round these deserted plantations. They were probably born on them, and are loth to leave. They buy or hire their little plots of ground from the owners of the estate or their agents. I have conversed with many of these people, and I have been amused at their utter ignorance of the fact that the world at large, holds them responsible for the ruin of Jamaica. While proprietors say that the negroes are too independent to work; the negroes say that proprietors are too poor to pay, or that they won't pay regularly, which is a great grievance to a people that live from hand to mouth. There is doubtless, truth in both assertions. But when I see an abandoned estate still surrounded by industrious settlers and laborers, I think it something like *prima facie* evidence that the proprietor in England has abandoned them—not they the proprietor.

I passed a Sunday in the Moneague, and it was a model of quiet and respectability. The churches were filled with well-dressed and attentive congregations. There was no drunkenness or debauchery, or assemblage of idlers in the village, during the entire day. But church attendance and

Sabbath observation at least than these, that these people of being bred deny altogether hire, or that world, under They are the Sabbath listen, with to the land thing. It his neighbor rule, no sense of half a day laboring class times past for curse of Slanthropist! am not Sam I find peculiar own conclusions

Correspondent

The following is the son's reply to the above, which is unmistakable

John Brown, a summons, pear before ceedingly they have satisfied pear before you can have Virginia migration and arrival

Of this, fear. In the papers, he made an interview (John Brown) rance you can son who has of either He swer upon a committed by should the w the Harper's cution, by forth be executed

These are a pledge of m on Friday m that neither tested, but a returned to you come to Tilden, and propriety of mind to go, I will also has there even tion to the c week being I leave th with whom

M. JOHN Sir: I have me that you lect Committee pear before After a which you for two reasons going to and

Sabbath observance are no proofs, among a negro population at least, of moral rectitude. It is upon other grounds than these, that I have combated the ridiculous assertion that these people are either physically or morally incapable of being brought up to the level of the Caucasian race. I deny altogether the statement that they will not work for hire, or that they will not work as well as any people in the world, under a proper training and a wholesome stimulus. They are perfect paragons in their outward observance of the Sabbath. They sing psalms; they quote Scripture; and listen, without a yawn, to sermons that would hurry sages to the land of Nod. But emancipation has not done everything. It has not cured the negro of a certain partiality for his neighbor's wife; it has given to the wife, as a general rule, no sense of shame to see her six children the off-spring of half a dozen different fathers; it has not impregnated the laboring classes with any more reverence than they had in times past for the law of Meum and Tuum. "The lingering curse of Slavery," says Rev. Mr. Piouseyes. No, Sir Philanthropist! I cannot go in bodily for your pet theories. I am not Sambo's champion, right or wrong. I record what I find peculiar in his character, and let others draw their own conclusions.

W. G. S.

Correspondence between U. S. Marshal Johnson and John Brown, Jr.

The following letters explain themselves. It will be seen that the son of "Ossawatimie" has the spirit of his father, and his reply to the government official rings out in clear and unmistakable language:—

JEFFERSON, Jan'y 4th; 1860.

John Brown Jr., Esq.—Sir: I left at your house to-day a summons from the Select Committee of the Senate to appear before said Committee on the 30th inst. I regret exceedingly that I was unable to see you, for I think I could have satisfied you that it would be to your interest to appear before the Committee. The only objection I suppose you can have to do so, is the fear that the authorities of Virginia might take advantage of your presence in that region and arrest you, and take you to that State.

Of this, I take it upon myself to say you need have no fear. In the letter from Senator Mason enclosing me the papers, he makes use of this language, viz: "If you can get an interview, or other means of communication with him (John Brown) he may be induced to come under the assurance you can give, that by a late law of Congress, no person who has been examined as a witness before a Committee of either House of Congress can afterwards be held to answer upon a criminal charge for any fact or act done or committed by him, to which his testimony may refer. Thus, should the witness have done anything in connexion with the Harper's Ferry affair which might subject him to prosecution, by testifying before the Committee, he will thenceforth be exempt from prosecution."

These are the words of Senator Mason, and to that I add a pledge of my sacred honor, that if you appear in Cleveland on Friday morning next, and accompany me to Washington that neither on the way nor in that city shall you be molested, but after giving your testimony, I will see you safely returned to your home. I propose that on Thursday next you come to Cleveland and see Judge Spaulding, Judge Tilden, and other friends, and consult with them as to the propriety of going, as I propose, and if you make up your mind to go, that we leave that city on the following day. I will also state that I have no warrant for your arrest, nor has there ever been any issued, from any source, the assertion to the contrary by the "Cleveland Plain Dealer" of last week being an unmitigated falsehood.

I leave this letter with your friend Smith Edwards, Esq., with whom I have fully conversed on that matter.

Yours, M. JOHNSON.

DORSET, ASHTABULA, Co., O.,
January 25th, 1860.

M. JOHNSON, Esq., U. S. MARSHAL, CLEVELAND, OHIO—Sir: I have received your favor of the 24th inst., informing me that you had left at my house a summons from the Select Committee of the U. S. Senate commanding me to appear before that Committee on the 30th inst.

After a full and careful consideration of the reasons which you offer why I should obey that summons, I have for two reasons resolved not to do so. The first, is, that in going to and returning from Washington, I must of necessity

pass within the jurisdiction of either Maryland or Virginia. The latter State has especially exhibited, of late, such a remarkable facility of perpetrating the grossest injustice under the forms of law, that no sane man would, in the circumstances in which I am placed, trust her for a moment. Even if that State could not crush me by a judicial process, the wildest enthusiast would not dream her power would be thrown between me and the violence of her mobs.

The protection under the law of Congress, to which Senator Mason refers, you will see, if his language is correctly quoted, applies only to "a person who has been examined as a witness;" but supposing otherwise, what regard has the Nullifying State of Virginia for a law of Congress which would interpose between a victim and the malice of her slaveholders? I have experienced too much of slaveholding perfidy to rely on the faith of a State whose honor and magnanimity are represented by the author of the *Fugitive Slave Bill*, and whose chief revenue is derived from the sale of her own sons and daughters.

The second reason why I refuse to appear before that Committee is, that in swearing to "tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth," so far as my knowledge extends, in reference to the facts sought for, in that investigation, I should obligate myself to make known that which would implicate others, which, as the Lord liveth, I will not do. You say that by giving my testimony I can exempt myself from further trouble. In answer, I would say that I cannot purchase immunity from further prosecution by an act of treachery. To that system of piracy which reduces to chattels every sixth man, woman, and child of our land, I owe no obligations. It has no rights which I am bound to respect; but, to the noble men and women, who, in the same spirit which prompted effort in behalf of Greece, Italy and Hungary, labored by word and deed to aid "Native Americans," descendants of the "first families of Virginia," to throw off their yokes—to them I owe unswerving fidelity. Some of them reside in Slave States, and my testimony would place their lives in jeopardy. On their account, if for no other, I refuse to appear and answer, and shall patiently wait for the infliction of "the pains and penalties in such cases made and provided."

And now to save unnecessary delay in pouring out upon me the "vials" of pro-slavery "wrath," I will say that business does not now call me to Canada. Should I revisit that temporary home of our American Exiles, it will be from other considerations than those of personal safety.

Possibly, at some time I may "leave my country for my country's good," but never for the good of the Slave Power. With due respect, I remain, &c., JOHN BROWN, JR.

STRAINING AFTER POPULARITY.

The lack of piety shows itself, in our day, in straining after popularity. One is truly popular by the force of his talents and the favor of his piety: another, because he seeks it as a main end. Between these there is a wide difference. One is simple and solemn; the other is magniloquent and affected. The one oppresses by his thoughts; the other, by his manner and words. The one attracts by the solemnity and power with which he presents and applies divine truth; the other, by his newspaper notices, his quaint subjects and texts, his odd illustrations. The one wins converts to Christ; the other, admirers of himself. The one preaches boldly the doctrines of the Cross; the other withholds or modifies them lest they should offend, and blunts every arrow, lest it should penetrate, emulous only of the reputation of a popular preacher.

How many and sad are the lessons taught us by the history of the Church, as to the great evils arising from an unconverted ministry! How sadly the Jewish Church suffered from false prophets! It was an unconverted apostle that betrayed the Lord of glory! For how many ages were the boasted successors of the apostles, the vilest of men! And how, even now, in Germany, the lowest infidelity is decked in the robes of the ministry; and in England, the merest worldlings, because second or subsequent sons of the gentry, are promoted to Church benefices! and how, in communions regarded as evangelical, an unsanctified ministry are prostituting the order and ordinances of God's house to the purposes of superstition, and to the supplanting of a spiritual by a formal and ritual religion.

Piety, then, is the first great essential element of a true minister of the gospel. Without this a preacher is but a

sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal. He is a minister only in the technical sense of the word.—*Dr. Plumer.*

Very true.—One of the commonest and surest signs of "an unconverted ministry" is to be found in the clerical apologies for slavery, or silence in respect to its abominations like the false prophets in the Jewish Church. The love of popularity, and the fear of being unpopular with worldly wicked men, is evidently the temptation that overcomes them.

NORTH SITUATE, MASS., Feb. 1860.

Br. Goodell, I send \$1.00 for the *Principia* one year. I cannot afford to be without such a paper. The foundation principles of this paper are of God, and will stand forever. O how this slavery cursed nation needs something that will reach the seat of its disease! superficial treatment will never effect a cure. Political pretenders have administered their quack nostrums, which at most have only relieved symptoms, without removing the cause. How weak, pusillanimous and humiliating is the position of the Republican party in Congress, compared with what it might be, if they would take "radical" ground. They make such large concessions to slavery that their moral power is paralyzed.

By the way, can you, or any one else inform us, how it can be unconstitutional for California to pass laws excluding Chinese emigrants from that State, and yet be entirely constitutional for a State to pass laws excluding natives of our own country from settling within its bounds; or what is still more atrocious, expelling free colored, or white people from their territory, who are guilty of no crime whatever! I think it is high time this matter was taken up, in good earnest, and discussed in our public papers, and elsewhere.

I have not time to write as I could wish, but I throw out these thoughts, as I pass.

Yours truly,

T. C. TINGLEY,

Pastor of the Bap. Ch. in North Sitate, Mass.

MR. THEODORE TITON'S reply to Rev. Henry Ward Beecher, on the pro-slavery position of the American Board, delivered during the late discussion in the Plymouth Church of Brooklyn; first published in the *National Anti-Slavery Standard*, and afterward in pamphlet form, is a very able and timely publication, and one which would seem to set that controversy at rest, for the present. It is for sale at the *Standard Office*, No. 5 Beekman St., at 3 cts. single, or \$2.50 per hundred. We hope it will be extensively circulated, and its facts and arguments pondered and remembered, as they ought to be.

AN official correspondence between Gov. Hicks of Maryland, and Gov. Gist, of S. Carolina, in relation to the proposal of the latter State to hold a Southern Convention, has elicited from Gov. Gist, an explicit denial that the movement is intended to promote a secession from the Union.

RESOLUTIONS have been passed by both Houses of the Legislature of Mississippi, affirming that the Constitution of the United States, recognizes property in slaves, and consequently that the Government created by it, is bound to secure to the owners of slave property, its possessions and enjoyments. How will those who concede the premises, avoid the conclusion?

A curious circumstance, took place last week in Louisville, Ky. Saturday the papers contained an obituary notice of the death of a Mr. Morris, and an invitation to his friends to attend the funeral, from the corner of Market and Brook streets. Saturday morning the hearse and carriages were at the door. The body of the dead man had been clothed in the funeral raiment, and inclosed in a coffin. Numbers of friends had assembled. Suddenly the man in the coffin gave signs of life. Rumor states that he kicked the coffin lid off. At any rate he was saved from a death by burial alive, and is doing well.

Ralph Plumb, in his testimony before the Harper's Ferry Committee, acknowledged the existence of an organization in Ohio, called the "Sons of Liberty," whose platform of principles is simply as follows:

"No man shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law, while we have power to prevent it."

That would seem to be a perfectly constitutional organization! That is to say, it is about as treasonable as the U. S. Constitution itself.—*Er'e True American.*

The Principia.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1860.

"THE GALLANT KENTUCKIAN,"—AND THE KENTUCKIAN EXILES.

The whole Country, and by this time, perhaps, a great part of Protestant Christendom have heard of the expulsion of the Missionaries, Rev. John G. Fee, and his associates, from the State of Kentucky, of which they were peaceful, and worthy citizens, many of them natives, without even the forms of law, for no crime but that of preaching the gospel, without concealing its testimony against the oppression of the poor. The whole country too, and not a few in foreign lands, have heard of the "gallant Kentuckian," Cassius M. Clay, who likewise opposes that same oppression, in his native State, and is known as the friend, and until recently, as a patron of John G. Fee, and his associates. It is natural to inquire in respect to the bearing and influence of "the gallant Kentuckian" towards his old condjutor, whom he still calls his friend, in the hour of his persecution and peril. On this point, Mr. Clay has spoken for himself. As journalists of the struggle between slavery and freedom we propose to exhibit what he has said.

In the *Principia* No. 8, for January 7, we published a letter of C. M. Clay to the editor of the *Richmond (Va.) Messenger*, under date of Dec. 28, in which he said:

"It is well known that on the 4th of July, from the stump three years ago, I denounced the doctrine of the 'Radical Abolitionists,' and the Rev. John G. Fee, that 'there is no law for Slavery,'—and again in a letter addressed through the Press, to Rev. Jas. Davis, I repeated my disavowal of any such political sentiment on my part. I have again and again declared that whilst I was willing to defend the liberty of speech, and the Press, 'to the uttermost,' as the duty which I, in common with every citizen of this Commonwealth, and this nation of freemen, owed to my country—that I did not believe the 'radical doctrine right,' and, therefore, I would not jeopard my life in any such false issue. And this I said to Mr. Fee in private, long before our public separation. But, on the other side, I have never said that Fee, or any other man, or set of men, ought to be expelled from the State. I have always said that if the Radicals, Fee, or any other man, or set of men, violated the laws, that I would aid in bringing them to punishment; and that if there was no law to punish our holding, or avowing Radical views in a Commonwealth holding slaves—that the slaveholders had the political power—let them pass a law to meet the case. I am now, ever have been, and ever shall be, the sworn enemy to mobs, as the worst kind of all possible despotisms."

In publishing this letter, we took occasion to notice, that while Mr. Clay declared himself ready to defend freedom of speech, and of the press, for himself and his political party, he took equal pains to declare that he did not demand nor advocate the same freedom for his friend Mr. Fee, and the "Radical Abolitionists," but was willing to see them silenced, so that it was only done by "passing laws to meet the case," and we desired to know whether the tone of this letter was to be regarded an indication of what Abolitionists were to expect from the ascendancy of the political party of which Mr. Clay was so prominent a member, and for which so many Abolitionists had been voting.

Time has rolled on, and tendencies have been maturing, and taking shape. The slavery party in Kentucky, emboldened, doubtless, by the twice repeated utterances of Mr. Clay on July 4th, and December 28th, have adventured to carry into execution, what they had so long desired. They have driven out from among them the "Radical Abolitionists" by mob violence, without waiting to go through the forms of legislation suggested by Mr. Clay.

Mr. Clay has looked on, and seen it all; has seen families, the old and the young, driven from their homes. And what does he say now? Does he remonstrate against the deed itself? Or only against the mode in which it was done? Here again, Mr. Clay has not left us in doubt. In his "Speech at Frankfort, (Ky.) from the Capitol steps, Jan. 10, 1860," as "reported for the Cincinnati Gazette," and published in pamphlet form, he said:

THE MADISON COUNTY MOBS.

"Now, gentlemen, for a few personal explanations before I enter upon the vindication of the Republican party, I allude to the expulsion of the Rev. John G. Fee, of Kentucky, and some nineteen other citizens of the Commonwealth by birth

and choice, from their homes, and their departure into exile. "Some three years since, on the Fourth day of July, when Mr. Fee returned again to the State, after a temporary absence, he took the ground of what may be called the Radical Abolition party, that as a citizen of the Commonwealth, he owed no allegiance to the constitution and laws adopted and enacted on the subject of slavery, and that he planted himself on the higher law of natural right. Although I acceded to him, that which I now believe and still assert, that he was honest—that he was pure in his purpose, that he was actuated by the highest love of Christian charity, yet it was not the ground upon which I stood, as I was a constitution and law loving man, I argued to him that I could not and should not longer stand by him, that I owed it to myself and owed it to those laboring men of the country who held no slaves, whose cause I pleaded, and who confided in my leadership, to say to them that his was an unsafe and untenable position, and one which no man can hold; that it would immediately bring them into conflict with the laws of the country, and that that position, no matter by whom strengthened, could not be maintained. That is what I told him and them. Well now, I am no Don Quixote, to go forward and fight the battles of every man who may venture an opinion upon the subject of slavery; and am I to be accused as a seditious man and denounced by others as a bully because I was willing to stand by those men who took and maintained the ground that I had taught them to stand upon? I put it to every man that hears me, if it would not have been base in me, after I persuaded men comparatively ignorant, to come out and take ground against slavery, if I had deserted them? Although I love life as much as any man, and have perhaps as much to live for, as any man, I would die ten thousand deaths before I would be guilty of such base ingratitude. I say this, that wherever a man, planting himself on the broad constitutional ground of our fathers of 1776, follows me, I will stand by and defend him, to the best of my ability and give him such protection as I can, when the laws of the country refuse to give him what the constitution guarantees to him as his right. Therefore I could not stand by Fee and his associates. I believe he is as pure a man as ever I knew, yet I did not believe his position was tenable, and I was not willing to take ground with him. I not only proclaimed this, on the stump, but at a later day, when I was asked by men sympathizing with him, coming from other portions of the United States, if I could not conscientiously lend him my aid and countenance in carrying on his work and enforcing his doctrines. I declined by letter, announcing that I could not stand upon the platform of Mr. Fee; upon that ground we must split. He was responsible for his act, and I for mine. That has been my whole course in connection with these parties.

It is untrue—it is absolutely and entirely untrue—on the other side, that I said that these men ought to be expelled from the Commonwealth. My position was one of strict neutrality. I said that while I was willing to see these men removed by law, if they violated any law, I was the sworn and eternal enemy of mobs, come they from what source they might. As soon as I heard that my name was connected with this transaction in that way, that I, who had fought against some eight or ten mobs, had come and sanctioned a mob, I immediately wrote to the editors of the *Richmond Messenger* and the *Cincinnati Gazette*, utterly denying it, and stating my views. What was the result? I was told, eight days after, it was done, and that with the influence of my name, he of the *Messenger* received my letter. In eight days he received my letter, at a distance of about an hour's ride from my office. That was what Judge Field told me the day before I left. I have inquired with regard to the other letter to the *Cincinnati Gazette*, and have learned that there has been no such letter received in that quarter.

LEE AND JOHN BROWN.

What further? Mr. Fee is stated here as sanctioning the raid of Brown upon Virginia. [A voice on the outskirts—"Hurra for Brown." Let us be honest! Fee is an exile; he is a native Kentuckian; he has, away from this, explained himself, and I have received a report of the speech at Brooklyn, and he there stated that while he admired the self consecration, or in other words the devotion, of John Brown, he did not approve of his course, nor of his way of settling the slavery question; in other words, he was opposed to insurrection. It was his view of the matter that he should go to slave-holders, and by argument induce them, and by the force of divine teaching, persuade them to relinquish their hold upon the slaves.

A SORRY HOAX.

Well, gentlemen, the report reaches us of boxes of Sharpe's rifles having been transported through the ordinary channels of commerce to Berea. After these men are removed, we are now told that this was all a hoax. All I have to say about that is, that it was a very sorry hoax. A sorry hoax as far as Fee is concerned, doing him great injustice, imputing to him a criminal intent that he did not entertain, and a purpose he did not design, and so far as the Commonwealth is concerned, certainly it is a sorry hoax.

So much in connection with that subject. I admit that a great many very respectable gentlemen in the county of Madison were in this affair—men for whose character and lives I have a profound respect, personally and good feeling and friendship. All that I can say is that I regret on their account, this transaction, but more especially do I regret the influence this thing must have upon the large class of the people of the county who were receiving the benefit of the education that these men were bestowing. Mr. Fee has nothing to lose—he will go where he will be paid as a time serving man or as other preachers of the Gospel of Christ; but the number of the uneducated, constitu-

ting two-thirds of every born child in the mountains around that little colony, will be the sufferers by his absence.

THE NEW GOD.

We are told also in that report that this man imported a new god—that the slaveholders' god was not good enough for him and his associates, and this is attributed as a reproach. I knew the community in and around Berea when I was a boy, and I say that they were of the most vicious people that ever I did know; a drunken, tobacco chewing, whisky drinking people; debauchery and fighting could there be seen as plainly as the noon day sun. But now, how is all this changed. The price of land has advanced as these gentlemen themselves admit, and morality reigns where disorder was predominant. Why, sir, they have invaded the great State of Kentucky. How! With Sharpe's rifles, pistols, and bowie knives? No! but with the New Testament, the school house, the church, and the saw mill. It has even been objected that they were erecting a saw mill. Where before the inhabitants dwelt in huts without windows and with mud floors, these men have introduced neat frame buildings. The children that before were indulging in idleness and dissipation, had been reformed and were going to one of the best schools in Madison county, and in so saying, I make no single exception. A certain degree of self-respect has been inspired in the people, and I venture to say that now there is no better people in the State than those who surround the colony of Berea, in the county of Madison. This is the new god they introduced. No sir! No new God has been introduced. It is the same God who before the long centuries created the heavens and the earth, who based His Throne upon the eternal principles of justice, and draped it in the undying beauty of harmony, liberty and love.

Such are the statements, of Cassius M. Clay. By his showing, Mr. Fee and his associates, were driven out of Kentucky, not for participation in the movement of John Brown, nor for approbation of that measure, but because of their being opposers of slavery, to the extent of being "Radical Abolitionists,—teaching that there is no law for slavery." This is further evident from the fact that violence towards them was first manifested before the affair at Harper's Ferry, as was also Mr. Clay's "denunciation" of their doctrines even three years previous to that violence, which it must have tended to produce.

By his own showing, likewise, Mr. Clay's opposition to the promulgation by Mr. Fee and others, of "the doctrine of the Radical abolitionists—that there is no law for slavery" was so great that he had no objection to their being silenced or removed, provided "a law to meet the case" were provided. Mr. Fee was "as pure a man as he ever knew"—but he "was willing to have him removed"—so that it were done by law. "My position was one of strict neutrality" says Mr. Clay. But on such a subject, there can be no neutrals. The declaration of neutrality is equivalent to hostility. "He that is not with me is against me."

But, says Mr. Clay, the ground of Mr. Fee "was not the ground on which I stood."—Well Mr. Clay, suppose it was not—what then? Do you accord freedom of speech and of the press, to those only who agree with you? Where is the autocrat, in the Old world, or elsewhere, who does not claim that freedom for himself, and his partisans?

He is "no Don Quixote to go forward and fight the battles of every man who may venture an opinion on the subject of slavery."—But that is not the issue. The question is whether freedom of speech and of the press, shall be accorded to "every man," or whether "laws to meet the case" shall be framed to suppress it. What says Mr. Clay to this? "My position" says he, is one of strict neutrality!—Strictly neutral, on the question whether freedom of speech and of the press shall be secured to the "white" men of Kentucky—to those, who, like himself, opposed slavery—to "as pure a man as he ever knew"—"actuated by the highest love to, Christian charity" to "preachers of the gospel of Christ" to men who, "with the New Testament, the school-house the Church, and the saw-mill" were transforming and enriching the vicinity in which they lived, and whose inhabitants are sufferers by their expulsion and absence. "The gallant Kentuckian" who has been regarded the champion of freedom in Kentucky, is "strictly neutral" in respect to the freedom of speech and of the press, for such men! Alas for the cause of freedom, for either white men or colored men, in Kentucky, if it rests on the shoulders of "gallant Kentuckians" like these.

Though Mr. Clay pays a high and just tribute of commendation to Mr. Fee and his associates, as he could not avoid doing, yet at one point, he does them great injustice,—the very point upon which the hinge of his argument against them turned. By the vague, indefinite representation that they "took the ground—that as citizens of the

Commonwealth and the law of disorganizing the facts of Clay well consisted themselves they are a strict his own cal power, that those Republican from the S enacted on associates

And, whi ists—that them of fre if it be such enunciated Mr. Grant sentatives, dorsed by l tered, as w witness, at address, d Young Men the paramo Independent a valid law effect. It ent Republ large, in B be increase is now to b and of the

PREMIUM Church and tlemen a co Society for northern cl all respons Webster, I Murdock, York, Meth prize, are names of th the chairm ry, Rev. H.

A KIDN Times, unde

An atten man living i of Big Sprin groes within as many, for

It was ab of the house woman imm back window who immedi carriage sta livery stable the man-sta to go to th boarding.

The little Roberts, and bath, with o at the river they saw he objected to a life, and prom would spare thirty minut he had a hor

Commonwealth, they owed no allegiance to the Constitution and the laws," &c., he conveys the idea, that they were men of disorganization and insubordination—allegations which the facts furnished by Mr. Clay himself, disprove. Mr. Clay well knows that the extent of their insubordination, consisted solely in refusing to obey wicked statutes, holding themselves liable to the unrighteous penalties by which they are enforced. Would the "gallant Kentuckian" restrict himself within limits equally narrow, if the case were his own? Suppose "the slaveholders who have the political power," should "pass a law to meet the case," ordaining that those who hold the views of Cassius M. Clay, and the Republican party concerning slavery, shall be banished from the State? Would he submit peacefully to "the laws enacted on the subject of slavery" as did Mr. Fee and his associates to the decree of the mob?

And, what is there in the heresy of "Radical Abolitionists—that there is no law for slavery," that should deprive them of freedom of speech, and of the press? This heresy if it be such, is held, and is sometimes and in some places, enunciated, by some prominent Republicans, themselves. Mr. Granger uttered it distinctly, in the House of Representatives, and his speech, on that point, was at the time, endorsed by Horace Greeley, in the *N. Y. Tribune*. It was uttered, as we are now assured, by a competent and reliable witness, at our elbow, by Cassius M. Clay, himself, in his address, delivered at Chicago, July 4, 1854, before the Young Men's Association, of that city. He then maintained the paramount and binding authority of the Declaration of Independence, and consistently added that "the pretense of a valid law for slavery, was a humbug," or words to that effect. It was by means of similar declarations of prominent Republicans, that their party vote was swelled up so large, in 1856—and we doubt whether its vote in 1860 is to be increased by Mr. Clay's intimation that his creed of 1854 is now to be proscribed by a forfeiture of freedom of speech and of the press.

PREMIUM TRACT.—The Executive Committee of the Church Anti-slavery Society, have made the following gentlemen a committee of award for the prize offered by that Society for the best tract upon the question, "How shall northern churches and Christians absolve themselves from all responsible connection with slavery?" viz.: Rev. J. C. Webster, Hopkinton, Congregational Church; Rev. J. W. Murdock, Boston, Baptist Church; Rev. M. French, New York, Methodist Church. Manuscripts competing for this prize, are to be sent, with sealed envelopes containing the names of the authors, up to the first of July next, either to the chairman of the committee of award, or to the Secretary, Rev. H. T. Cheever, Jewett City, Connecticut.

News of the Day.

A KIDNAPPER IN KANSAS.—A correspondent of the *N. Y. Times*, under date of Lawrence, Feb. 13, writes:

An attempt was made here last week to kidnap a negro woman living in the suburbs of the city, by a man named Roberts, of Big Springs, and several others. This Roberts has lost negroes within the past year, and now declares that he will steal as many, for revenge. But this attempt did not pay.

It was about 10½ o'clock in the evening, when the inmates of the house heard a rustling about the windows. The negro woman immediately suspected the danger, and escaped by the back window to a neighbor's. There were men in the house who immediately raised the alarm. The thieves had a covered carriage standing at the door that was hired from one of our livery stables for three days. While the crowd were gathering, the man-stealers slipped away. But Roberts was daring enough to go to the Mansion House, where he had previously been boarding.

The little army of freedom suddenly repaired thither, caught Roberts, and took him to the river, intending to give him a bath, with orders to swim for his life. But when they arrived at the river bank, the ice was running so thick and strong that they saw he could have no chance for his life, and the majority objected to such cold treatment. He begged earnestly for his life, and promised never to be seen in Lawrence again, if they would spare him. It was agreed, therefore, that he should have thirty minutes to leave town, and he at once hastened to where he had a horse saddled, and commenced his sudden flight.

By accident, however, or otherwise, he had not proceeded far before he was accosted by four or five negroes, who seized him, took the horse from him, and how much more they did we never could learn; but he was obliged to flee, and has not been heard from, since.

The river is now clear of ice and weather warm. Emigration to the mines has commenced, and from present indications there will be a larger stampede than we saw one year ago. Still I dare not encourage it. The facts do not warrant the wild excitement on the subject.

WRECK OF THE STEAMER HUNGARIAN.—ALL HER CREW AND PASSENGERS SUPPOSED TO BE LOST.

HALIFAX, Feb. 21, 1860.

The large steamship ashore on the west side of Cape Sable is the steamship Hungarian, which sailed from Queenstown on the 9th inst. for Portland.

She is a total wreck, and all her crew and passengers are supposed to be lost.

A small portion of her hull is now visible at low water. Nothing like the news despatch for the Associated Press can be found, but it is thought it may be in the mail, a small portion of which has been saved in a damaged state.

One passenger ticket has been found, with the name of Ellen Sheehan upon it.

The following has been sent from Cape Sable to Messrs. Cunard & Co.:

"A steamer's lights were seen on Monday morning at three o'clock; at day break the spars and pipes were seen standing; and at 10 A. M. all had gone by the board. Then the ship settled fast. A heavy sea was running, breaking mast high over the ship. Communication with the ship was impossible. All on board must have been lost, unless the boats left the ship before daylight, which is not likely. At low water, part of the ship is still visible."

This is all the news that can be obtained to-night.

The Hungarian left Liverpool on Wednesday, the 8th inst., under command of Captain Jones, and touched at Queenstown, Ireland, as customary with the vessels of the line, steaming away the next afternoon (Thursday, the 9th inst.) for Portland.

The Hungarian was on this occasion, on her third voyage from Liverpool to Portland, her preceding trips having been accomplished in good time and under very favorable circumstances.

By the arrival of the *Europa* at Halifax we have European advices to the 12th inst., one week later than the accounts previously received. The political news is meagre, but somewhat interesting. The French troops in Italy had received orders to march at short notice, and it was supposed the occupation of Tuscany was contemplated in the event of Piedmont continuing to oppose the annexation of Savoy to France. The principal propositions of England for a settlement of the Italian question had been rejected by Austria. The British financial budget had been presented to Parliament, and was regarded as satisfactory. In London money was in active demand.

In New Mexico, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, introduced a Bill to repeal the act of last session, protecting slavery. The next day he was requested to resign the Speakership, which he did, resigning also his seat in the House, and went home. His bill was rejected, without a dissenting voice. We remember how Daniel Webster and other leading politicians assured us that the climate and soil of New Mexico secured it from slavery.

We have received the Glasgow Bulletin of Feb. 1., containing an account of a "reception soiree to Mr. Frederick Douglass, the celebrated Negro advocate." A sketch of his speech on the occasion is given, which "was received with great applause." The Rev. Mr. Edmond, and others, moved and spoke on Resolutions, expressing their condemnation of slavery.

The Committee on the Federal Relations of the Legislature of Massachusetts, have given a second hearing to the petitioners for a law to prohibit the delivery of any person into slavery from Massachusetts. The Committee were addressed by Rev. John Pierpont, of Medford, Samuel E. Sewell Esq., of Boston, Francis W. Bird, Esq., of Walpole, and Wm. Lloyd Garrison. Mr. Pierpont having argued the anti-slavery character of the Constitution, Mr. Garrison ex-

pressed his dissent, and made an argument on the other side, which we think, could not greatly have helped the cause. At a previous hearing, the Committee were addressed by Rev. Charles Beecher of Georgetown, Rev. J. Sella Martin, and Rev. Dr. Murdock of Boston. "The friends of the desired law, (says the correspondent of the *A. S. Standard*), are greatly encouraged by these hearings."

A memorial has passed both Houses of the Kansas Legislature, addressed to Congress, asking for admission immediately, under the Wyandotte Constitution. "The people here never will vote to extend our boundary, either to the mountains on the West, or the Platte on the North, even if it is made the ultimatum of our admission."

The Bill of the Kansas Legislature, prohibiting slavery still remains with the Governor, who, probably will veto it, to avoid decapitation by the President of the United States.

WILLIAM STILL of Philadelphia, having visited Canada, and investigated the condition of the fugitive people of color, residing there, contradicts the statement of the *Detroit Free Press*, and *New York Herald*, concerning their degraded character, and miserable condition, stating facts and statistics of a totally opposite character. To the same purpose, he produces the testimony of Dr. J. Wilson Moore, and his lady, Rachel Barker Moore, of Philadelphia, who visited Canada in 1835, for the express purpose of ascertaining the truth for themselves.

MRS. BEECHER has been pronounced by her physician as improving. It appears that she has suffered much from nervous pains, besides those incidental to her wounds and bruises, and the want of rest in consequence has delayed her recovery.

The new "Constitutional Union party," has made a demonstration in New York City, by holding a mass meeting at the Cooper Institute. Gen. Scott appeared on the platform, and was "greeted with great enthusiasm" by his admirers. Speeches were made by James W. Gerard, Hon. J. M. Harris, and Hon. Geo. Briggs. Letters were read from Hon. J. J. Crittenden, Edward Everett, and Hon. Joshua Hill, of Georgia. The Resolutions adopted, condemned the agitation of the slavery question outside of the slave States, pledged the meeting to "abide by, and uphold, as the law of the land, the construction of the Constitution pronounced by the Supreme Court" and declare a willingness "to leave the Constitutionality of all future legislation by Congress, by the States and by the Territories, to be determined by the same august tribunal."

CONGRESS.—In the Senate, the House resolution appropriating ten thousand dollars for the inauguration of WASHINGTON'S statue was passed. Mr. BROWN'S resolution was then taken up, and Hon. DANIEL CLARK, of New-Hampshire, spoke at some length in opposition. Mr. CLARK recounted the annals of Pro-Slavery agitation since 1850, showing that institution during the past ten years had become daring and aggressive, and prophesying its early extension over the soil of the Free States. M. TOOMBS, of Georgia, took occasion from a remark of the Senator to deny that he had ever engaged to call the roll of his slaves in the shadow of Bunker Hill. In conclusion, Mr. CLARK repudiated the of the Senate from Mississippi, that Slavery was the keystone of the Federal arch. He pronounced it rather a cobble stone, adding nothing to the strength of the structure, which indeed would be stauncher for its absence.

IMPORTATION OF SLAVES INTO KENTUCKY.—By a statute passed in 1833, the importation of slaves into Kentucky for purposes of traffic was forbidden. A bill has been introduced into the Legislature, repealing so much of this law as remains upon the statute book. The proposed measure excites much opposition. The *Frankfort Commonwealth* says that if the law is repealed, the gates will be opened for all the felons and insubordinate slaves of Virginia and Maryland.

The *Kansas Herald of Freedom*, in consequence of its change of opinions and infamous attacks on John Brown, and its betrayal of the interests of freedom in Kansas, has been deserted by its former supporters, and, as a natural result, has ceased to exist.—*F. Douglas, Paper.*

Sentence of Stevens and Hazlett.

CHARLESTOWN, Feb. 14, 1860.

The court room was crowded yesterday morning, to hear the sentence of the law passed upon Hazlett and Stevens. Some time was occupied by counsel in presenting bills of exception in the case of Hazlett, and it was twelve o'clock before Stevens was brought into the court house. The prisoners were brought into court by the sheriff, jailor, and a guard of twenty men of the Jefferson Guards. Both prisoners wore an unconcerned air, and seemed utterly untrifled of the awful position in which they have placed themselves.

The clerk having asked the prisoners if they had anything to say why sentence should not be passed upon them, both responded that they had.

Stevens then said: "May it please the court, I have a few words to say. Some of the testimony given against me was untrue. One of the witnesses stated that I said, 'Let us kill the——— of ——, burn the town.' To those who know me, it is useless to make a denial of this charge; but I deny here, before God and man, ever having made such a proposition. I wish to say, I am entirely satisfied with the conduct of my counsel, Mr. Sennott. I think he did all in his power in my behalf. I desire also to return my thanks to the officers who have had charge of me for their uniform kind treatment, and to my physician for the services rendered me whilst suffering from my wounds. When I think of my brother slaughtered and sisters outraged, my conscience does not reprove me for my actions. I shall meet my fate manfully."

[This reference is understood to be the treatment of his Northern brethren and sisters, during the Kansas broils.]

Hazlett then spoke as follows: I have a few words to say I am innocent of the charge on which I have been convicted. I deny ever having committed murder, or ever having associated with any one with such intentions. Some of the witnesses have sworn to things which I deny, and which were positively false. For instance, in reference to my beard; I have never in my life, until my imprisonment in jail, allowed my beard to go more than three weeks without shaving, and all testimony, therefore, as to the length of my beard, is false. Again, Mr. Copeland testified that I was sitting on a stool when he entered the cell at Carlisle; this I deny; I was sitting on a blanket, back against the wall, and another man was on the stool. Copeland also said there were only two men in the cell; this is false, as there were four other white men in the cell with me, and we comprised all the white prisoners in the jail. Others of the witnesses made false statements, but I forgive them all. I have been treated kindly since my confinement—much better than I had expected—and I must say, I think better of Virginia. I wish also to return my thanks to the counsel who have so ably defended me; they have done more in my behalf than Northern counsel could possibly have done. I repeat, I am innocent of murder, but am prepared to meet my fate."

The prisoners having concluded, Judge Kinney proceeded to sentence each of them to be hung publicly on Friday, the 16th day of March next, between the hours of ten o'clock A. M. and two o'clock A. M.—*Cor. Balt. Star*

THE CONSTITUTIONAL UNION PARTY.

The proposed conservative party, has at length been formally announced in an elaborate address to the people of the United States, signed by a "central Executive Committee," composed of about thirty names, among which we notice John J. Crittendon, Ky., W. C. Rives, Va., Washington Hunt, N. Y., Lewis Condict, N. J., Francis Granger, N. Y., John Broome, &c. The latter signs as Chairman of the National American Ex. Com., and F. Granger, as the Chairman of the National Whig Ex. Com. The address sets forth the dangers to be apprehended from the agitation of the slavery question by the two great political parties, the Democratic and the Republican, and says:

"As an indication of the character of this struggle, of its objects and possible consequences, we need only point to the significant fact that a convention has been called by one of these parties, to select a candidate for the office of Chief Magistrate of the Union, from which, by the necessary logic of its construction, fifteen States of that Union are excluded.

Solemnly impressed with these facts, a number of gentlemen from different parts of the country, among whom were members of the present Congress, and of Congresses of former date, recently assembled in the city of Washington, to deliberate on means for averting dangers to which they may lead.

It was the unanimous opinion of the meeting, that immediate steps should be taken to organize a "constitutional Union party," pledged to support the "Union, the constitution, and the enforcement of the laws."

This organization was accordingly commenced by the appointment of a "Central Executive Committee" charged with the general direction of the party, and with the preparation of an address to the people of the United States.

The objects and platform of the party are thus stated.

"To remove the subject of slavery from the arena of party politics, and leave it to the independent control of the State in which it exists, and to the unbiassed action of the judiciary.

"To remove all obstacles from the due and faithful execution of the provisions for the rendition of fugitive slaves.

"To cultivate and expand the resources of the country by such protection to every useful pursuit and interest, as is compatible with the general welfare, and equitable to all.

"To maintain peace, as far as possible, and honorable relations to all nations.

"To guard and enforce the supremacy of the laws by an impartial and strict administration of the powers granted by the constitution.

"To respect the rights and reverence the Union of the States as the vital source of present peace and prosperity, and the surest guarantee of future power and happiness."

"To teach reconciliation, fraternity and forbearance, as the great national charities by which the Union is ever to be preserved as a fountain of perennial blessings to the people."

The two tangible points of this platform, are (1.) the rigorous enforcement of the fugitive slave bill, and (2.) a protective tariff. How the enforcement, at the North, of the most odious and unpopular part of the Slave Code is to "remove the subject of slavery from the arena of party politics," we are not informed. And how the effort to revive the political economy against which South Carolina raised the standard of nullification is to commend "conciliation and fraternity" at the South, we are equally left to conjecture.

Special Dispatch to the N. Y. Tribune.

WASHINGTON, Tuesday, Feb. 21, 1860.

THADDEUS HYATT ORDERED ARRESTED.

Upon the application of the Harper's Ferry Committee, the Senate to-day ordered a process to issue against Thaddeus Hyatt, to bring him before the bar, to answer an alleged contempt, in not appearing to testify. Mr. Hyatt had been here an invalid for several weeks, having come in answer to the summons of the committee. For this and other reasons, he claimed time to determine whether he would testify either under protest, or not at all, disputing as he did, the authority of the inquisition. He notified Mr. Mason yesterday, that he would decide in a few days, and asked that indulgence for preparation. Mr. Mason replied that if he did not appear yesterday by twelve o'clock, he would ask the Senate for process to-day. Under these circumstances, Mr. Hyatt left the city for the East this morning to consult his counsel, and, perhaps, to test the preliminary question by habeas corpus before a State tribunal, when the order of the Senate shall be served.

In the Senate, Mr. Seward introduced a bill for the admission of Kansas into the Union. It was arranged that Mr. Seward should address the Senate on Wednesday next, when he will probably develop his programme for the Presidential campaign. In the House Mr. Lamar delivered a speech on the slavery question, and Mr. Davis, of Maryland, expressed his views with regard to the censure passed by the Legislature of his State upon his vote for Mr. Pennington for Speaker.

SINGULAR DEATH OF A LADY.

The wife of Julius M. Smith, Esq., of Concord Mass., about 30 years of age, wishing to have a number of teeth extracted, desired the surgeon to administer to her whiskey, in order to render her insensible during the operation. He advised her not to resort to whiskey, as did another physician, whom she had consulted. But as she still desired to take it, saying that she feared the effect of ether or chloroform, and believed that whiskey would be equally efficacious, and at the same time free from danger, a tumbler full and a half—that is, two and a half gills—were given to her, mixed with sugar, in the space of an hour.

The operation was then performed, and for ten or twelve hours the patient presented only the ordinary symptoms of intoxication, except that, for a few minutes, she appeared like a person in an apoplexy, but soon recovered. About an hour after drinking the whiskey, she vomited freely, without pain or

unusual difficulty. Her pulse, and breathing were natural, and the family and friends who called in the course of the day and evening, felt no apprehension till twelve o'clock Monday night, when the doctor, who, feeling some anxiety in consequence of the symptoms of apoplexy manifested, had remained with her during a greater part of the evening, requested that another physician be called for the purpose of having a consultation. Nothing, however, could be done, and she expired at about seven o'clock on Tuesday morning, without having shown any sign of returning consciousness, or of suffering

France and Savoy.

The *Independence Belge* professes to be able to "lift a corner of the veil" which covers the question of the annexation of Savoy. It states that France in signing the offensive and defensive alliance with Piedmont, previous to the marriage of Prince Napoleon, engaged, by a secret clause, to liberate Italy to the Adriatic. The King of Piedmont, in return for this engagement, and the advantages which would accrue to him, promised to cede Savoy to France. There are now two opinions as to what should be done. If Italy is not "free to the Adriatic," Piedmont is nevertheless in a much more advantageous situation than was here before the war, seeing that King Victor Emanuel is in a position to bring under his sceptre, not only Lombardy, but Tuscany, Modena, Parma, and the Romagna, without prejudice to the rest, while, if the original understanding had been carried out, and Austria had been completely expelled from Italy, Piedmont, would have been able only to obtain a portion of the States of Parma and Modena, Lombardy and Venice—Central Italy remaining under the Grand Duke of Tuscany and the Pope, or forming a separate State. France, therefore, claims that the conditions of the treaty have been fulfilled in spirit, and she demands the cession of Savoy. The other opinion is for the rigorous fulfillment of the letter of the treaty. Venice being still under Austrian dominion, Piedmont is still free to hold Savoy.

An elderly lady named CHITIE died a few days since on a train of the Pacific Railroad. She was accompanied by a son-in-law and family, and was on her way to Alabama. She was represented as being at the advanced age of 102 years, and that she expired almost before it was known that she was ill.

C. C. Coe, the balloonist, who was so severely injured by his fall from a tree last September, is slowly recovering. He is yet confined to his room, and has to be helped out of bed upon his feet; when once up he can, with the help of a cane, with some difficulty walk about the room. It will be some time yet before he fully recovers.

The Portland (Me.) *Advertiser*, says: In glancing at the valuations of the various towns, cities and counties, and comparing them with the valuations of 1850, we are struck with the very marked and decisive progress which our State has made within the past ten years. The total valuation in 1850 was \$98,242,254. In 1860, it is \$162,472,914.

THE second anniversary meeting of the John street prayer Meetings was held yesterday at the John street Methodist Church. The house was well filled. A short history of the origin and progress of those meetings was given, and instances were related by those who have attended them, where prayers had been answered in a signal manner. The meeting continued about an hour.

THE English papers announce the disappearance of Kosuth of London. The Birmingham *Post*, in commenting on the fact, says there can be but little doubt that he has gone to Hungary with revolutionary purposes.

BANGOR, Monday, Feb. 20.

BENJAMIN KIMBALL, a member of the Penobscot Bar, was to-day convicted of forging a deposition by which he obtained a divorce from his wife. A motion in arrest of judgment and a bill of exceptions to the ruling of the Court are pending.

The Richmond *Whig* says that it is almost certain that neither Maryland, Kentucky, North Carolina, Tennessee, nor Missouri, will send commissioners to the proposed Southern Convention, showing only a partial representation of the Southern States, and with the border States refusing to unite in its deliberations, would probably be totally inefficient, if not injurious, to our interests.

—Ellen in Chicago Kearney, once, resolute, her m

The inv bargained the N. Y.

The exa the Senate stantially

came to K commenced in Missouri they here

into Kansa bers of the service; j where they young men

paring groo ry; soon a Southern I belonging to

gan stock Wattles tha permanent North Elba

ly to defend were driven in their jour with Wattle

tle remnant returned to the Mendiz

rius killed vices to gua souri; he r with himsel

ees, nor mo ions; this co ger had pass and hardship

fever and a house until claim for his up some hay terward sold

Mr. Maso that had to d

Wattles re acted like oth homes, and h

plated any in ven from Kan Kansas. He

his doctrine v from Kansas. Mr. Wattle

1858 and 185 them request and invite th

very importan lips, and aske

plied that he one mentioned had letters fi

Secretary of t from Professio

sin, furnishing people of Kan Territory in th

arms and amn to any one.

his invasion of for the last tin see him, when

been into Miss demned the Ki

stopping at a h

—Ellen Welch was recently arrested on a charge of vagrancy in Chicago. She was well brought up at her home, Castle Kearney, Ireland, where her father, a man of wealth and influence, resided. She was the niece of the famous Daniel O'Connell, her mother, Margaret O'Connell, being his sister.

IMPORTANT TESTIMONY.

The investigating Committee are getting more than they bargained for. The following is from a Correspondent of the N. Y. Herald.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 20.

THE HARPER'S FERRY INVESTIGATION.

The examination of Augustus Wattles is concluded before the Senate Brown Raid Committee. His testimony is substantially as follows:—John Brown and his two oldest sons came to Kansas in the fall of 1854; they took claims and commenced improvements; they spent the following Winter in Missouri, mostly at West Point, on the border of the State; they here learned the plans of the pro-slavery party to go into Kansas in the ensuing spring and vote, elect the members of the Legislature, pass a slave code, and enforce its observance; in the spring of 1855 they returned to Kansas, where they were joined by the wives and children of the young men; the old man aided them in building houses, preparing ground for crops, and putting out a valuable nursery; soon after this, the two younger sons arrived from Southern Illinois, with a valuable drove of blooded cattle belonging to John Brown, Jr., and two stallions of the Morgan stock belonging to Jason Brown; the old man told Wattles that he came to Kansas to aid his sons in making a permanent home, but he expected to return to his family at North Elba, New York; he had no intention of fighting only to defend his rights; in the fall of 1856 he and his sons were driven out of Kansas by the United States dragoons; in their journey from Ossawatimie to Nebraska they stopped with Wattles for several days, while gathering up the little remnant of property they had left and selling it; Brown returned to Kansas in the summer of 1858, immediately after the Mendizine murders, when Hamilton and other Missourians killed twelve free State men, and volunteered his services to guard the frontier against further inroads from Missouri; he raised a company, who all signed an agreement with himself not to go into Missouri under any circumstances, nor molest any person in Kansas for their political opinions; this company remained upon the border until all danger had passed away, and they then broke up; by exposure and hardship he and some of his men were taken down by fever and ague, when Wattles again took them into his house until they recovered; Captain Brown then took a claim for his son Jason, and commenced improving it; he put up some hay, which he mowed on government land, and afterward sold to supply himself with money.

Mr. Mason here interrupted, and wanted to know what that had to do with his invasion of slave States?

Wattles replied, that so far as he could judge the Browns acted like other settlers in their efforts to make themselves homes, and he did not believe that Captain Brown contemplated any invasion of the slave States till after he was driven from Kansas, and then only as a measure of defence to Kansas. He had no funds, and every man who approved his doctrine went with him, which was not over half a dozen, from Kansas.

Mr. Wattles presented letters from Brown, written in 1857, 1858 and 1859. These were read and explained. One of them requested him to see William Phillips and others, and invite them to meet him (Brown) at Tabor, Iowa, on very important business. He showed the letter to Mr. Phillips, and asked him what the meeting was for? Phillips replied that he did not know, but he could not attend. No one mentioned in the letter went to that meeting. He also had letters from Mrs. Hinton, of Waukesha, Wisconsin, Secretary of the Female Aid Society of Kansas, and also from Professor Edward Daniels, State Geologist of Wisconsin, furnishing him with funds and clothing for the poor people of Kansas who had been robbed and driven from the Territory in the summer of 1856. He had never received arms and ammunition from any quarter, nor supplied them to any one. The only allusion which Brown ever made to his invasion of Virginia was when he was leaving Kansas for the last time. Mr. Wattles being sick, Brown called to see him, when Mr. Wattles expressed his regret that he had been into Missouri and taken slaves, and especially condemned the killing of Cruise. Brown replied that he was stopping at a house on the Little Osage when the men went

down to Fort Scott to liberate Ben Rice. It chanced that a poor colored man came along, looking for some one to help him get his wife and children out of slavery in Missouri. I told him to go home and prepare and I would come for him. I did so, and have brought eleven human beings out of bondage without firing a gun or snapping a cap. He was then told that another company went to another place and brought away four, and in doing so had killed one man to save their own lives. Brown replied that he "regretted it exceedingly. The taking of human life was a terrible thing; but," he continued, "I have considered the matter well—you will have no more inroads from Missouri: the people of Kansas have suffered enough; my heart bleeds for them; I now see it to be my duty to draw the scene of the excitement to some other part of the country; you may never see me again. Farewell—God bless you." And he departed.

To-day the committee demanded the attendance of Hyatt before them, but he sent a letter declining. This will be considered a case of contempt, and will bring Hyatt before the Senate.

Family Miscellany.

For The Principia.

EARNEST TO JULIA.

(An "Bertha and Lily.")

I have a dream
Of something fairer, purer far
Than all thy glowing beauties are—
A distant gleam,
Some dim foreshadowing of the hour
When all thou art shall lose its power,
And joyless seem.

I see a face
Most lovely in its meek, sweet grace;
Its holy eyes
Beam on me with a soft surprise;
God's seal upon the gentle brow
Of suffering past, but bearing now
Fruit for the skies.

But thou of Earth—O, all of earth!
Gay butterfly of song and mirth,
Dost hold me still,
Don't fascinate my worldly sense,
While she doth draw away from thence,
Hope's nobler fill.

Methinks from far,
I gaze and see how these things are!
Amid night's glittering host
One ray that charmed me most
Sinks paling to the western bar;
But in the eastern skies
Shall fair resplendent rise
My morning star.

E.

CONNAL'S VISION.

Imitated and altered from Ossian.

Beneath an oak, young Connal slept,
By the sound of the mountain stream;
A trembling coldness o'er him crept,
He woke from a troubled dream:—

When lo! the form of her he lov'd,
Came sudden to his sight;
Silent and motionless it mov'd,
Than shadowy mist more light.

"Marion!" he cried, in sore affright,
"Why, to the warrior's vale
Dost thou bend thy lonely steps, at night?
"And why art thou so pale?"

She stretch'd her snowy hand, to speak,
Dim, and in tears, she stood;
As rises the gale of the reedy lake,
Heard in the distant wood,

So, faintly rose her feeble voice,
Dreary and wild, yet sweet;

"O Connal! youth of my maiden choice,
"No more on earth we meet."

"Within the narrow house I sleep,
"Yet still remember thee:
"Nor, lingering long shall Connal weep,
"Prepare to follow me."

She spake, and through her airy form
Dim twinkled the star of night,
And, like the fading meteor borne,
"She glided from his sight."

E. L. E.

For the Principia.

THE AIM OF LIFE.

"How much better is it to get wisdom than gold, and to get understanding, rather than to be chosen than silver."

"Three weeks more, and we graduate! no more of books, no more of tasks. Oh! isn't it a pleasant thought, after these long-weary years of study?"

Thus exclaimed the gay and beautiful Carrie Ross, to a classmate.

"It is a sad one to me," replied May Anderson, the very plain young lady addressed, "these have probably been my best years, my precious seed, since henceforth, I am thrown upon my own self-resource, in the wide world."

"Poor May! life, no doubt, looks dark enough, while the rest of us are so joyous. Maggie is to be married, Grace is going abroad, so we shall all be scattered. I am sure I envy Grace."

"I envy no one," replied May, "my mother told me, before she died, that self-reliance was the lesson for me; said she, 'May, my child, you can never depend upon personal charms, for your success in life. God has given you a better gift than beauty, so cultivate your mind; here are five hundred dollars, all I have to leave you, use it for your education. The Lord will point your future course.' These were her last words."

"Poor May! what can you do?" said Carrie, in a tone of unaffected sympathy.

"I have no definite plan," replied May, "the Lord has not yet revealed his will. I expect a very busy life, however. I have no desire to live for myself, at all; perhaps I shall be a Missionary."

"Fine sentiments, May. I wish I could, from my heart, as from head, respond to them. There is certainly great beauty in the life of a devoted Christian Missionary."

"So I have thought," said May, "ever since I determined to live a self-denying life."

"But after all, May, it is mere sentiment, all young ladies must have some romance, that kind may do for you, since"—Carrie paused.

"I know what you mean, Carrie, since I cannot from my helpless plainness expect the homage of admiration," said May. "Perhaps dear Carrie, if I were like yourself, I might have the same temptations to a worldly life. I may be self-deceived."

"No! No!" exclaimed Carrie, "I know you are not, but—" The door opens, and four smiling faces enter the little sanctum, where the class of six were wont to meet.

"The last care is off my mind, I have finished my essay," shouted Grace Carroll, "it is very good," she added, in a tone of irony, at the same time drawing down her little round face, in a vain effort to look sober.

"What next, Gracie?"

"Oh! the search after happiness, of course. I am going abroad, you know. I believe, as Fowler expressed it in his lecture, that happiness is the great end of human life, any road to that, I infer to be a safe one."

"That is my doctrine!" chimed in several. "What say you, Miss Anderson?" asked Grace Carroll.

"I cannot fully concur," replied May. "However, let us more fully understand each other, before waging a war of mere words. Do we mean by happiness, pleasure—our own personal enjoyment?"

"To be sure we do!" said Carrie Ross. "Happiness means fun. If we love fun better than anything else, as I do, then fun is the great supreme good of life."

"A new Theology, truly," said Grace Carroll, "and pray Miss Ross, how do you define fun?"

"Fun means balls, parties, conquests, with a great deal of laughter, music, and beauty."

"Very well, Carrie, I accept your definition," said May

Anderson. "But is this the highest reach of human beings endowed with mind, soul, and heart, and inspired with a consciousness of immortality?"

"No, indeed!" exclaimed Grace, indignantly. "I expect to learn a great deal, to expand my ideas, develop my resources; in short, to make as much of myself, as I can."

"That is certainly a duty," replied May, "but is that all?"

"I suppose," said Miss Grey, "that we all, as young ladies of education, expect in some way, to attain a position of influence in society; we may then be useful to those less favored than ourselves. This, surely, is an object worthy of life, and is infinitely higher than pleasure, or even intellectual acquirements."

"Certainly, Miss Grey," concurred May Anderson. "Intellect, unsanctified, is a curse to the world, and a mere life of worldly pleasure, far, very far below the aim of any reflecting mind."

"It all seems to come around to the same point; one would attain happiness in one way, and one in another," said Gracie. "Happiness must be the end, come at it as you will, by fun, scholarship, or study."

"With this difference, Grace," said May Anderson, seriously: "with the duty doing, and study loving, happiness is not the end sought, but only one of the very many precious results flowing from its pursuit, either as natural consequences, or direct rewards."

"Do you intend to say," asked Miss Grey, "that disinterested goodness, aside from a hope of happiness, is more than an abstract idea?"

"I do intend that, exactly. I believe it perfectly practicable."

"You are very Puritanical, May Anderson, to say the least," said Gracie.

"One would think in these days, that the term Puritanical was one of reproach. I nevertheless accept it as the highest tribute that can be paid to the lover of principle," returned May.

"Decidedly ultra, isn't she, girls?" said Carrie Ross.

All this time, pretty Maggie Edwards, who was expecting to be married very soon, was bending her waxen head over a most delicate bit of embroidery. She had not expressed any interest in the discussion. The chief end of woman, as she understood it, was quite within her grasp, and very nigh at hand. A beautiful house on Grand street was already purchased, and very rich furniture selected to adorn it: the greatest question that remained to be settled, after that hateful essay should be written and read, was, whether *Satin or Mor Antique silk, would be most genteel*, for a blonde bride. Poor Maggie!

"Miss Tefft and Miss Edwards have not blessed us with an idea," said Grace Carroll; "pray, Agnes Tefft, since you are fully capable, decide for us the merits of this case."

"Do Agnes, do Miss Tefft," exclaimed all the young ladies, in a breath.

"Well, young ladies, since you confer this great honor upon me," replied the very wise and practical Miss Tefft, "I shall defer judgment ten years, when each of you may, if you please, report your progress in life, and your experience. I trust by that time, I shall be sufficiently matured to pass a judgment which shall solve the two great problems—'Is disinterested benevolence possible? And is it the greatest good?'"

RED PARSONAGE.

To be concluded.

For the Principia.

Meditations on Sweeping a Room.

Now I suppose Charlie, Sen. would not think this parlor needed any sweeping? Stay! I'll throw open the blinds, and take a general view. The most striking thing is the disarranged furniture. As for dirt, there is nothing very definite about it, only the carpet seems enveloped in a dim, hazy atmosphere, making it look a little dull and faded. Probably the aforesaid Charlie, Sen. would just set every chair and ottoman strait back against the wall, and consider the room "put to rights!" Probably he would think me quite fanatical for insisting upon any more radical reformation. However, he is safe in his dear, conservative old office—so here goes.

There now! every ottoman, chair, and table, out of the room, and the carpet presents an unbroken surface to the application of the broom. Now, broom, do your duty!

Presto! what a dust! Who would ever have dreamed of

all this, lying so innocent and unsuspected in the embrace of this carpet? Now it is flying into my face, and all over the room. How much worse I have made matters! Just see how much mischief agitation has done! Here this poor, unoffending dirt was lying quietly upon the floor, and would never have thought of flying all over, so furiously, if it had not been for the broom! True, the carpet would have remained rather dingy, but then we can't expect to have everything perfectly pure and bright, in this world of dirt. Better to choose the least of two evils. This shows the folly of trying to make everything perfect, all at once, instead of using a little reason and judgment, and smoothing over matters, and making the best of existing circumstances. Here I have just gone to work on a mere principle; a principle deduced from the syllogism "All evils should be removed: dirt is an evil; therefore dirt should be removed." What an impractical idea to carry out! What a visionary I am! Why could not I have taken all these things into consideration, and calculated the consequences, before starting such a wild scheme? And yet,—pause a moment!—here I have collected quite a quantity of dirt in my dust-pan. So much the less in the parlor. And now I remember past experience, and that I've seen dustier times, and brought out everything bright and clean.

Women are naturally reformers. It is in them; "in their bones," as Candice hath it, according to the philosophy "of the bones," alias "intuition." Yes; there is a difference in mind, between the sexes. Witness the totally opposite effects which house-cleaning, sweeping, or any kind of "clearing up" produces upon them, respectively. We women are all radicals. Arming ourselves with broom and scrub-brushes, hot water and soap, we strike at once at the root of the matter. Not a word of compromise will we hear; not a bit of this smoothing over, and letting go—no, indeed! everything has got to be moved, and turned up side down, and inside out, and every nook and corner explored, and every particle of dust, and every guilty, trembling little wretch of a string, nail, old paper, soiled napkin, ancient glove, antediluvian shoe or boot, dragged forth to the light of day. Disconsolate mortals of the other sex gaze upon the scene with mingled astonishment and dismay. Vain are their feeble interpositions; their pleadings for "peace and tranquility." "First pure, then peaceable," is the most gracious promise vouchsafed, and they are obliged to fall back upon the pleasures of hope, for consolation. On our banner is engraved, "No compromise!" Nothing short of the entire abolition of dirt, throughout our domains will answer our purpose.

Now men are timid, conservative creatures. They dislike agitation. They cannot bear to have things disturbed, any more than Dinah could, in that wonderful kitchen that Mrs. Stowe has immortalized. Take a peep through the key-hole into any "batchelor's hall" and see if 'tis not so! See if the table, in the middle of the room with both leaves up, isn't loaded with the most interesting variety of papers, pens and ink, dishes, pins, thread, and scissors! See if the floor doesn't hold several cubic feet of old newspapers, bits of white paper smeared with ink, poker, coal-scuttles, splinters, and all well peppered with dust. No doubt the worthy proprietor, in his heart of hearts, considers all this an evil. But how is he to help himself? Somehow it seemed to come so very naturally, and without any effort on his part; and perhaps he cherishes the hope that it may "die out," if let alone. At any rate it would only make matters worse, to commence any agitation, as he found one time, when he began to pick up things around, till the dust almost suffocated him. Such are men.

No wonder they don't like to have us, women, peer too into their great political kitchen! Keeping "batchelor's hall" there as they do, it isn't strange if it should get a little dusty; and hating agitation as they do, it isn't strange that it should stay dusty. They step out of it so smooth and shining before us, that they think we won't know the difference, but 'tis really funny to see how frightened they are, for fear we shall catch them in it! How they hold up their hands in horror, and entreat us not to think of such a thing as opening the door, or even peeping through the key-hole. How they insist it is so contrary to our angelic natures (complimentary to themselves, that;) something we don't understand; and, above all, that there is some terrible dragon inside, which will be sure to swallow us down bodily, the moment we enter, and we never shall be heard of, again, and what will become of them? Never mind, let's get posses-

sion of the key, somehow; we can get around them; and then we'll get in, and we'll give it such a scrubbing and cleansing, and fix it up, and make it look ever so pretty. We know how!

Here I've been leaning meditatively over my broom this half-hour, instead of being at work! Meanwhile the dust has nicely settled and ready for me to wipe off. * * * And now that I've rubbed over and arranged the furniture I am ready to sit down and take another "general view." How bright and beautiful the carpet has become. Its gay cluster of roses look smilingly up into my face, as much as to say, "thank you." And the chairs and stands and what not, have settled down into their accustomed places, their faces beaming with sober content. Some one has said that every atom, is the universe in miniature. Why isn't my parlor then, the world on a small scale? And when the world gets dirty why shouldn't we arm ourselves, and go to work at it, without being afraid of the dust. It will come out bright, pure, fresh, like my parlor.

HOUSEKEEPER.

A KIND LITTLE GIRL.

A very poor man had a very good little girl. She had a fat, chubby, sweet face, and her cheeks looked like peaches when they are ripe. Her hair hung in ringlets all over her head, and some rich feathers would have made her look like a fairy, with nice dresses and costly trinkets. But Lulu's father was poor, and her clothes were only decent; but she, sweet girl, was kind and good, which is better than to be rich. Riches have spoiled a great many little girls, but Lulu had no chance to be spoiled in this way.

One day she saw a lame old man going by, wretchedly clad, with a pack on his back. Lulu thought he must be cold or hungry, or need something to make him comfortable, so out she ran, without saying anything to her mother, and soon overtook the stranger.

"Man!" said she, "my father always gives poor folks something to eat; won't you come back and get some bread?" The old man turned about, as if he were surprised. Perhaps he thought a bird of paradise had just dropped down there, and was singing. He was unused to such soft, sweet voices as that; and then her message was so kind and good!

Lulu thought the old man did not understand her, because he stood and gazed upon her, in silence. So she said again:

"My father always gives poor folks something to eat. Won't you go back with me, and get some bread?"

The old man smiled—he could not help it. If he had felt cross, we doubt if the cross could have kept down that smile. He turned about, and Lulu took his hand and led him back to the house. What do you suppose her mother thought, when she saw her little daughter leading in that ragged stranger?

"Here, mother," said Lulu, "is a poor lame man who is hungry, won't you give him some bread?" Her mother looked pleased, and hastened to feed the stranger, while Lulu set him a chair close by the fire, and viewed him from head to foot, as if she thought he were Lazarus, as poor and good.

We need not tell you how long he stayed, nor what he said about Lulu, when he went away. We are more concerned to know what our young readers will think and say about this kind little girl. Was it not a beautiful spirit that caused her to think of the beggar's wants? Ought not every boy and girl to be as thoughtful and kind? Remember the charming hymn;

"Little deeds of kindness,
Little words of love,
Make our earth an Eden,
Like the heaven above."
"Little seeds of mercy,
Sown by youthful hands,
Grow to bless the nations,
Far in distant lands."

Juvenile Instructor.

WRITINGS OF WILLIAM GOODELL.

For sale at the office of the Principia:
DEMOCRACY OF CHRISTIANITY, 2 Vols., \$1 50
SLAVERY AND ANTI-SLAVERY (History of) 1 Vol., \$1 00
AMERICAN SLAVE CODE, 1 Vol., \$0 75
TERMS CASH.

D. D. NICHOLSON, PRINTER, 109 WILLIAM STREET, NEW YORK.